

- 3 ~~3/4~~ A spar structure in accordance with Claim 2 wherein the fairing shaped profile_λ has a chord to thickness ratio between about 1.50 and 1.20. section
- 4 ~~4/5~~ A spar structure in accordance with Claim 2 wherein the fairing shaped profile_λ has a chord to thickness ratio between about 1.20 and 1.10. section
- 5 ~~5/6~~ A spar structure in accordance with Claim 1, wherein the fairing shaped profile section comprises a vertically extending fairing rotatably mounted about the floating hull.
- 6 ~~6/7~~ A spar structure in accordance with Claim ~~5~~ wherein the fairing shaped profile_λ has a chord to thickness ratio between about 1.50 and 1.20. section
- 7 ~~7/8~~ A spar structure in accordance with Claim ~~5~~ wherein the fairing shaped profile_λ has a chord to thickness ratio between about 1.20 and 1.10. ~ ~ section

REMARKS

New Claim 6 presents the subject matter of Claim 3, allowing insertion of dependent Claims 4 and 5 immediately following Claim 2 through which they depend.

Claims 1-3 are rejected for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) under an application of Horton in view of Jones, asserted as follows:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have provided the structure of Horton with a vertically oriented fairing. In view of the recognition in the art, as evidenced by Jones, that the use of faring with structure which is located in water where ocean current is present is desirable. The motivation for such modification is taught by Jones. As to claims 2 and 3, the particular manner in which the faring is arranged with respect to the spar structure is not considered to constitute a patentable distinction because it is old and well known in the art to make the fairing integral or to rotate with respect to the spar.

Respectfully, the fairing of Jones '605 is applied to a riser pipe. Combine this with a conventional or classic spar structure and you get a spar structure with faired